UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,456	10/06/2006	Sergei Kniajanski	KNIAJANSKI 1	8179
	7590 03/05/201 ¹ D NEIMARK, P.L.L.C	EXAMINER		
624 NINTH ST		TESKIN, FRED M		
SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/05/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/568,456	KNIAJANSKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Fred M. Teskin	1796				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 O</u>	ctober 2009					
	action is non-final.					
·=						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-44</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>20-44</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4,10 and 18</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 February 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	o-(d) or (f).				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1796

Detailed Action

Election/Restriction

Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1-19, in the reply filed on 10/21/2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Kang does not show or make obvious the common subject matter between elected Group I and nonelected Group II, and therefore unity of invention does exist. This is not found persuasive because even if Kang fails to show or make obvious the common subject matter between the two groups, the fact remains that Group I recites various special technical features which are not required for Group II. In particular, Group I has special technical features directed to a polymer composition comprising from (A) 15 to 85% by weight of a copolymer containing at least one block from 10 to 5000 mainly syndiotactic structural sequences of monomer units resulting from at least one substituted or unsubstituted vinyl aromatic monomer, and at least one block formed by 10 to 4000 monomer units resulting from at least one dienic monomer having mainly a 1,4-cis structure; (B) from 15 to 85% by weight of a polymer resulting from dienic monomers having a molecular weight between 6000 and 600000, wherein the contents of 1,4-cis monomer units is of at least 90%; and (C) up to 70% of a polymer resulting from substituted or unsubstituted vinyl aromatic monomers having a molecular weight between 1000 and 500000 and a degree of syndiotacticity in terms of syndiotactic pentads of at least 95%. None of the special technical features directed to weight percentages of (A), (B) and (C), syndiotactic structural parameters of (A) and (C), and content of 1,4-cis structure for each of the block of (A) formed by 10 to 4000 monomer

Art Unit: 1796

units resulting from at least one dienic monomer and the polymer (B) are required by the nonelected Group II claims. Accordingly, examiner maintains that unity of invention does not exist herein in that the inventions grouped as Group I and Group II lack the same or corresponding special technical features.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claims 20-44 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 10/21/2009.

Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: the chemical name of the final monomer is incorrect in that "N-N'-dimethyl..." should read --N-N-dimethyl...-, both methyl groups being attached to the same amino nitrogen.

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "alkyoxyde" in the penultimate line should read --alkoxide--.

Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: in the range "10 y 1000...", "y" should be corrected to --and--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the following grounds for indefiniteness apply to the indicated claims.

Regarding claim 1, the expression "up to 70%..." is ambiguous absent recitation of the basis on which the percentage is to be calculated. It appears from the antecedent disclosure that percent by weight may be intended (cf. Table I, definition of abbreviation PC%); however, clarification and appropriate correction are required.

Regarding claim 10, the claim is indefinite due to improper Markush language in the recitation "X is selected from the hydroxyl, ... or ... alkyl groups". Either "selected from the group consisting of ... and ..." or "wherein X is hydroxyl ... or ... alkyl" is proper; see MPEP 2173.05(h)(l).

Citation of Pertinent Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Zambelli et al is cited as pertinent to synthesis of styrene-butadiene block copolymers comprised of syndiotactic polystyrene blocks and cis-1,4-polybutadiene blocks, and the corresponding hydrogenate (note col. 15, lines 45+ and col. 21, lines 24-36). A polymer composition according to the present invention is not disclosed nor adequately suggested.

Conclusion

Claims 1-19 would be allowable if amended or rewritten to overcome the informality objections and rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in this Office action. Examiner has not, as of the date of this Office action, located or identified any prior art document(s) that can be used to render the polymer composition defined by said claims anticipated or obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner F. M. Teskin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM, and can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Fred M Teskin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Application/Control Number: 10/568,456 Page 6

Art Unit: 1796

.